

# BELIZEAN STUDIES

Vol.7 No.6 • November 1979

a journal of social research and thought

Colha, Belize: A Preliminary  
Statement on the 1979 Season

The Labourer's Riot of 1894  
(Part I)

Of Boats and the River

Index for 1979





BELIZEAN STUDIES is published six times  
a year by:

BISRA (Belize Institute of Social  
Research and Action)  
St. John's College  
Belize City  
Belize (British Honduras)  
Central America

Editors:

Richard Buhler, S.J.  
John Maher, S.J.

Advisory Board:

Mr. Leo Bradley  
Mr. Homero Escalante  
Mr. Vernon Leslie  
Rev. Lloyd Lopez  
Miss Signa Yorke

THE ADVISORY BOARD disclaims responsibility for statements, either  
of facts, or opinion, made by contributions. Comments and letters from  
our readers are welcome.

Single issues of BELIZEAN STUDIES may be purchased for \$1.00 each.  
The Annual subscription is \$5.00. Foreign rates: The Americas: \$6.00,  
U.S. and other places: \$8.00. Checks or drafts should be issued in the  
name of BISRA (Belize Institute of Social Research and Action), c/o  
St. John's College, Belize City, Belize, Central America.

# Belizean Studies Digitization Project

## OVERVIEW

Belizean Studies was the longest running journal dedicated to social science research on Belize. The journal features research in a variety of disciplines including cultural anthropology, archeology, decolonization, diplomatic relations, photo-history, oral history, biographies, literature and book reviews. It contains the work of some of the most pioneering researchers on Belize and is considered an invaluable repository of Belize's scholarship.

## OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the digitization project are to enable wider access to the journal; assist with the preservation of original documents; encourage research; and sensitize users and the public about the importance of research for the development of Belize.



## FUNDING

This project is funded by the Institute for Social and Cultural Research of the National Institute of Culture and History (ISCR-NICH), Belize.

## COPYRIGHT



Copyright © St. John's College, Belize.

All rights reserved to St. John's College. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except for individual education and research purposes.

## PUBLISHER CONTACT

St. John's College  
Princess Margaret Drive  
Belize City, Belize, C.A.  
+501-223-3732  
[president@sjc.edu.bz](mailto:president@sjc.edu.bz)  
[www.sjc.edu.bz](http://www.sjc.edu.bz)

## Publication Info:

**Reference Type:** Journal Article

**Author:** Ashdown, Peter

**Year:** 1976

**Title:** The laborer's riot of 1894 (part 1)

**Journal:** Belizean Studies

**Volume:** 7

**Issue:** 6

**Pages:** 8-20

**Suggested APA Citation:** Ashdown, P. (1976). The laborer's riot of 1894 (part 1). *Belizean Studies*, 7(6), 8-20.

**Host URL:** <https://www.belizehistorysjc.com>  
[www.belizehistoryassociation.org](http://www.belizehistoryassociation.org)



national institute of culture and history





# The Labourer's Riot of 1894

## (Part I)

The Soberanis "disturbances" of 1934-37 were not the first instances of working class dissatisfaction in the history of Belize. Those troubles had antecedents in the 'Ex-Servicemen's Riot' of July 22, 1919, and the riot of the capital's forest labourers in December, 1894. This 'Labourer's Riot' has previously gone largely unnoticed by historians and what mention has been made of it has erroneously attributed its causes solely to the change of currency of October of the same year.<sup>1</sup> In fact it was brought about by more than just a numerical reduction in wages, and it is of enormous significance in the history of Belize as it marks the beginning of the resistance of 'organized' labour to mercantile exploitation.

The riot was precipitated by a mutiny in the Constabulary in November, 1894, which itself had been brought about by the change in the Colony's currency of the previous month. The change was from a silver standard based on the Guatemalan sol (silver dollar) to a standard based on gold and the U.S. dollar. This had become imperative by late 1893 as Central American silver had depreciated 50% since 1892,<sup>2</sup> and this depreciation was playing havoc with the Colony's finances, turning its commerce into a gamble. Premiums on bills of exchange increased from 8% in 1891 to 60% in September of 1892<sup>3</sup> while prices of imported goods rose sharply to compensate for the devalued

---

*Peter Ashdown* is a doctoral candidate in modern Belizean History at the University of Sussex in the United Kingdom.

currency.<sup>4</sup> The merchants suffered, as their normal speculative business became unmanageable, but worst hit were the members of the Colony's working class who lived on an income fixed at the beginning of every year.

The talk of the Colony in 1892 and 1893 was not whether change was necessary, but which of the two gold alternatives would be best. After much, often heated, discussion it was decided to go over to the U.S. rather than Imperial gold, and the change was scheduled for October 15, 1894. On that day the sol was replaced by the U.S. dollar<sup>5</sup> at a rate of about 2 to 1 so that all wages, prices and rents were approximately, in numerical terms, half of their previous figure. However, it soon became apparent that the merchants were using the change as an excuse to raise rents and prices, and in this profittering they had been aided by the incompetence of the Colonial Government which had failed to take steps to reduce duties and taxes. In consequence merchants claimed their increases were justified by the greater duties even though, in many cases, they simply raised the prices of stock already in store on which they had paid duty at the old rate. The evidence for this is provided by a very reliable source, Frederick Maxwell, who cited examples to show that, in some cases, rents and prices had doubled and that enormous profits had been made especially on liquor. He concluded that "It was impossible to deny that this did press hard upon the labourer."<sup>6</sup>

It was not, however, the labourers who reacted first<sup>7</sup> to this sudden increase in the cost of living, but the Constabulary. The Constabulary was a para-military force set up in 1887 to replace the British West Indian regiment (which was being withdrawn) as guardians of the northern frontier. Its constables were located at Fort Munday and Fort Cairns in Orange Walk and Fort Barlee in Corozal Town, and its major role was to defend Belize against incursions from the Icaiche Maya across the Hondo. There was also a substantial Constabulary force in the capital which carried out mainly police duties. It was a highly unpopular body even among the Mestizo residents of the northern towns it was created to defend, as it was totally composed of Jamaicans and Barbadians who did not bother to hide their contempt for the local people and because it did very little, the Indian raids having declined since 1872 and the death of Canul, and yet was extremely expensive, averaging \$40,000 annually, one-sixth of the Colony's annual average expenditure.<sup>8</sup>

A large number of the constables had been recruited



in Jamaica in 1891-92 at the equivalent salary of £4.12.0p per month, and it would appear that on arrival in Belize these men already had a cause for grievance, as their salary of \$23 sols a month was less than they had been led to expect. From retrospective enquiry it would seem that \$23 was the agreed sum, but this had not been made clear to the men, who had failed to understand the niceties of the exchange procedures. On October 19 in Corozal that misunderstanding resurfaced when the constables there were offered \$11.50 gold plus 20% instead of their usual salary. A few of them accepted the money but the majority of the 24 men at Fort Barlee refused, despite the assurances of the Officer Commanding, Major Bayly, that their Jamaican grievance would be investigated. The officer, commenting on this incident, reported to his superior that "I do not anticipate any disturbance whatever in either detachment."<sup>9</sup> In this he was in error, for while the Corozal force remained loyal, if disgruntled, their comrades to the south revolted.

Three days later in Orange Walk the Constabulary detachment there also refused to accept the same proffered salary. They claimed, in justification of their action, that until then they had accepted the depreciated sols only because they had expected to get the equivalent in gold to £4.12s when the change had taken place and that the salary being offered was inadequate in view of the massive increase in prices since October 15. The Governor had this piece of information in his hands for only a few hours before he received word that, on November 1, 17 of the 24 men at Orange Walk had mutinied. Major Bayly reported that his men had failed to fall in for the 6 a.m. roll-call but had then come and demanded the release of one of their number who had been previously imprisoned for debt. This was refused and an attempt was made to arrest the men's ringleader, Constable Hall, for insubordination. Hall was, however, held for only a few minutes as his comrades attacked Fort Munday and smashed in the main gate. A fight ensued in which Sergeant-Major Patterson was cut on the head but the three white officers, while heavily out-numbered and deserted by the local people who were "terrified" were, for obvious reasons, afraid of opening fire. Discretion triumphed over valour and Bayly released Hall<sup>10</sup> and handed over the debtor, one Green. Reunited, the mutinous group then left for Belize, to put their case to the Governor, on the bungay "Mercedes" just after day-break.<sup>11</sup>

Bayly himself, after securing the armoury, immediately left Orange Walk for the capital by horse to alert

the authorities, arriving the next day after a fifty mile ride. The Governor promptly put a force under the Major on the steamer "Freddie" to intercept the mutineers but that action and the reason for its necessity soon spread the news of the mutiny around the capital. On that same morning the Belize Constabulary had signed for their salaries and "seemed satisfied" although they again raised their Jamaican grievance<sup>12</sup> but at 8:30 p.m. on the next night twenty-five of their number took to the streets, armed and intoxicated, and demanded to see their Commandant and the Governor.

Major Kaye and Governor Moloney were forced to agree to a meeting in the Police Station with the mutineers. That discussion brought out that the Belize Constabulary, too, were unhappy about their salaries and the rise in the cost of living, and that they had been incensed by an article in the 'Colonial Guardian' of that morning which implied that leaders of mahogany gangs could do their job with greater proficiency.<sup>13</sup>

The Governor, while wishing to arrest the whole group, was well aware that the populace of the capital was not without sympathy for the mutineers and, swallowing his pride, was forced to allow them to retain their arms and take over the army barracks at Newtown as a temporary base while negotiations took place.<sup>14</sup>

On the next morning, the 4th, Moloney hurriedly sent a fast boat off to bring back Bayly and his force while, rather ignominiously, he had to send the Inspector Commandant off to the barracks to talk with the mutineers as they had informed him they would tolerate no-one else. Kaye was followed to the barracks by a large crowd sympathetic to the mutinous detachment and in the ensuing discussion was forced to agree that all twenty-five could have their discharges, as this was the only condition on which they would be prepared to surrender their arms. The Governor, on receiving Kaye's report, was furious but had no choice other than accede to this demand, "seeing that there was no available force by which the mutineers could be coerced and that they undoubtedly would be supported by the mob in case of resort to violence."<sup>15</sup>

At 7:30 p.m. on the 5th the bungalow with the seventeen Orange Walk men arrived and they were met at the Court House wharf by their Belize comrades. Together they retired to the barracks after the Orange Walk group were also promised their discharge. The capital was then divided between a belligerent, armed, black force which



had power and popular support but no authority and an impotent, alarmed white government which had authority and the moral support of the Colony's propertied class but no power. To ratify his capitulation to superior force the Governor had called meetings of the Executive and Legislative Councils on the 4th. The Council members were truculent but accepted the fait accompli and approved the Governor's intention of offering \$23 gold to the constables who had not mutinied in order to retain their loyalty.<sup>16</sup> Moloney obviously feared a complete collapse of law and order and a general panic, for he got the Councils to agree to pay special constables \$1 a day and sent a telegram which read:

Urgent. Necessity for man-of-war. If there be none to spare one company of troops should be sent provisionally for garrison. Following telegram sent to Governor of Jamaica and Senior Naval Officer. Conversion of pay necessarily arisen from recent change in currency has unexpectedly produced dissatisfaction amongst constabulary which has had consequently to be diminished by discharge owing to which and to meet complications should any more arise man-of-war urgently required. Precaution against possible disturbances.<sup>17</sup>

These disturbances never materialised. Eight anxious days were spent by the Administration and the monied class until on November 15 the "H.M.S. Canada" arrived. It departed six days later with 15 of the discharged constables, most of the rest having left the Colony by their own devices, and was replaced on the 25th by "H.M.S. Partridge."<sup>18</sup> That man-of-war was retained as the Constabulary was now seriously diminished and the Christmas influx of labourers from their bush camps was about to begin.

That there was no more trouble after the Governor had agreed to allow the mutineers to break their contract indicated that their sole concern was to effect their discharge, not to overthrow the Administration. They considered they had been hired under false pretences and that they had a genuine grievance. That issue was thoroughly investigated afterwards without much of a satisfactory conclusion, as the original recruiting officers had all been transferred. As the claim for compensation by the ex-constables reappeared intermittently in the Colonial Office files until the 1920's, it is likely that in November, 1894, they thought they had good grounds for revolt.<sup>19</sup> Indeed the 'Times' had warned back in July



that the Constabulary wage was inadequate. That newspaper was sympathetic to the constables' grievance, if not to the manner in which it was manifested.<sup>20</sup>

Both newspapers were angry and frustrated. Firstly because the Administration had failed to appreciate the warning signs of impending trouble which they had both chronicled, and secondly because of its total surrender in the face of a challenge to its authority. The 'Colonial Guardian' pointed out that "at any moment a riot might have arisen which would, I doubt not, have ended in the annihilation of the constables, but in which many lives and much property would have been sacrificed on the part of the taxpayer."<sup>21</sup> The vulnerability of the capital's propertied class had been exposed. The Government's inability to meet force with force and its capitulation to a small group of malcontents at once aroused rage at its necessity and relief at its implementation. Riot and bloodshed were avoided at the price of humiliation,<sup>22</sup> but public opinion agreed it should not be allowed to happen again.

There were immediate demands for the dissolution of this "worthless body".<sup>23</sup> It was now severely diminished in numbers and local confidence in it, which had never been great, was completely demolished. The options were the revival of the old militia, Imperial troops or the creation of a police force if local men could be persuaded to police their own kind as they had been loathe to do in the past. The War Office having ruled out any permanent garrison of troops in British Honduras, it was eventually decided to create such a police body which would be built up while the Constabulary was re-organised and run down. That was one result of the mutiny of the constables, but a more immediate and important consequence was that in December, 1894, there was a British man-of-war at anchor in Belize harbour with a contingent of Imperial troops on board. Such a coincidence was to be of great value to the Colonial Government a month later when a serious outbreak of working class discontent manifested itself.

The 'Labourer's Riot' of December 11, 1894, could also trace back, as one of its ostensible causes, the change of currency of October 15. Both a hostile witness and a later historian<sup>24</sup> cited the numerical reduction in wages as the reason for the outburst. They argued that for the 1893-94 contract the mahogany cutters had received \$10-12 sols a month but were being offered \$5-7 gold for the 1894-95 contract; this reduction in figures the lab-

ourers were not supposed to have understood. The 'Petition of the Labourers'<sup>25</sup> which the Governor received three days prior to the disturbance shows that this was too simplistic an explanation of their grievance and subsequent actions. The men who had drawn up this document understood well enough the principle of the conversion and were really concerned about the rising cost of living which had accompanied it and the real reduction in wages which were being offered for 1895. They noted that during 1893 the sol had depreciated greatly, so that \$12 sols had only half the buying power of that sum in early 1892 and that, in fact, they had a legitimate case for an increase prior to the change in currency. That change they accepted meant arithmetically that \$6 gold was equal to \$12 sols but that, they argued, did not reflect the rise in the cost of living which had accompanied the change. Prices of basic requirements, they pointed out,

### *Petition of the Labourers Presented*

To His Excellency Sir Alfred Moloney K.C.M.G., Governor and Co

The Humble petition of the undersigned Labourers sheweth:

1. That there has been a great fall for sometime past in the price paid for labour in this Colony.
2. That this decrease has been concealed from observation by the decrease in the value of the Sols in which labourers have been paid, the effect being that while labourers were paid the same amount of Sols, they were in reality getting less each year for their labour.
3. That the change in the Currency has brought this decrease in the price of labour into terrible prominence — a prominence emphasised by the fact that all the taxes, duties and payments of whatever kind due to the Government are exacted in gold.
4. That labourers are now being offered only \$5 to \$7 gold a month with rations and on this pittance they have to support their families buying goods and paying rent at almost if not quite the same price in gold at which they bought them in Sols when they received \$14 a month in Sols.
5. Is it reasonable that labourers should be paid at 50 cents to the dollar while the Government extracts its dues in gold at 100 cents to the dollar?
6. Your petitioners further desire to bring under your notice a fact which deserves to be inquired into. A merchant and a member of the Council applied to labourers to unload bark logs but could not agree on the terms.



were almost at their pre-change figures.<sup>26</sup> They attributed this phenomenon to the fact that Government had failed to effect any change in the import duties, so that they were being levied in gold twice what they had been in silver.<sup>27</sup> The import merchants, who in many cases were also mahogany contractors and employers of labour, immediately passed on this increase to their customers.<sup>28</sup> This was understandable in view of their record but they had also unscrupulously added to the prices of goods already in stock on which they had only paid duty in sols. Therefore, while the cost of flour, pork and beef, the staples of the working class, had risen suddenly and landlords had taken the opportunity of the monetary chaos to raise rents,<sup>29</sup> the labourers' wages had fallen both in numerical and real terms.

The events which led to the riot started on Decem-

*ed to the Governor on December 8, 1894*

Commander in Chief of the Colony of British Honduras

Shortly afterwards prisoners were seen on the premises in question unloading the bark logs. Has the Government really interviewed (sic) in this manner to depress the price of labour?

7. Your petitioners are the real inhabitants of this Colony, the men by the sweat of whose brow in the forests, All its prosperity has been achieved, Yet they are without a voice in the Legislative Council of this Colony, without any one to protect their interests while both Councils are filled with merchants and other employers of labourers.

Your petitioners respectfully submit that the interests of the labourer classes should be more carefully looked after and protected and they rely upon your Excellency's professed attention to their welfare to inquire fully into the matter and see what steps can be taken even at this late date to relieve the distress of such a numerous and important class as the logwood and mahogany labourers. And your petitioners will ever pray etc.

Signed: John Alexander Tom

James McKoy

Isaiah Benglass

and signed by ninety-two (92) others.



ourers were not supposed to have understood. The 'Petition of the Labourers'<sup>25</sup> which the Governor received three days prior to the disturbance shows that this was too simplistic an explanation of their grievance and subsequent actions. The men who had drawn up this document understood well enough the principle of the conversion and were really concerned about the rising cost of living which had accompanied it and the real reduction in wages which were being offered for 1895. They noted that during 1893 the sol had depreciated greatly, so that \$12 sols had only half the buying power of that sum in early 1892 and that, in fact, they had a legitimate case for an increase prior to the change in currency. That change they accepted meant arithmetically that \$6 gold was equal to \$12 sols but that, they argued, did not reflect the rise in the cost of living which had accompanied the change. Prices of basic requirements, they pointed out,

were almost at their pre-change figures.<sup>26</sup> They attributed this phenomenon to the fact that Government had failed to effect any change in the import duties, so that they were being levied in gold twice what they had been in silver.<sup>27</sup> The import merchants, who in many cases were also mahogany contractors and employers of labour, immediately passed on this increase to their customers.<sup>28</sup> This was understandable in view of their record but they had also unscrupulously added to the prices of goods already in stock on which they had only paid duty in sols. Therefore, while the cost of flour, pork and beef, the staples of the working class, had risen suddenly and landlords had taken the opportunity of the monetary chaos to raise rents,<sup>29</sup> the labourers' wages had fallen both in numerical and real terms.

The events which led to the riot started on Decem-

*Petition of the Labourers Presented to the Governor on December 8, 1894*

To His Excellency Sir Alfred Moloney K.C.M.G., Governor and Commander in Chief of the Colony of British Honduras

The Humble petition of the undersigned Labourers sheweth:

1. That there has been a great fall for sometime past in the price paid for labour in this Colony.
2. That this decrease has been concealed from observation by the decrease in the value of the Sols in which labourers have been paid, the effect being that while labourers were paid the same amount of Sols, they were in reality getting less each year for their labour.
3. That the change in the Currency has brought this decrease in the price of labour into terrible prominence — a prominence emphasised by the fact that all the taxes, duties and payments of whatever kind due to the Government are exacted in gold.
4. That labourers are now being offered only \$5 to \$7 gold a month with rations and on this pittance they have to support their families buying goods and paying rent at almost if not quite the same price in gold at which they bought them in Sols when they received \$14 a month in Sols.
5. Is it reasonable that labourers should be paid at 50 cents to the dollar while the Government extracts its dues in gold at 100 cents to the dollar?
6. Your petitioners further desire to bring under your notice a fact which deserves to be inquired into. A merchant and a member of the Council applied to labourers to unload bark logs but could not agree on the terms.

Shortly afterwards prisoners were seen on the premises in question unloading the bark logs. Has the Government really interviewed (sic) in this manner to depress the price of labour?

7. Your petitioners are the real inhabitants of this Colony, the men by the sweat of whose brow in the forests, All its prosperity has been achieved, Yet they are without a voice in the Legislative Council of this Colony, without any one to protect their interests while both Councils are filled with merchants and other employers of labourers.

Your petitioners respectfully submit that the interests of the labourer classes should be more carefully looked after and protected and they rely upon your Excellency's professed attention to their welfare to inquire fully into the matter and see what steps can be taken even at this late date to relieve the distress of such a numerous and important class as the logwood and mahogany labourers. And your petitioners will ever pray etc.

Signed: John Alexander Tom  
James McKoy  
Isaiah Benglass  
and signed by ninety-two (92) others.



ber 6. On that day an "orderly crowd" of over one hundred men demonstrated outside the Government offices and demanded that a deputation of them be allowed to see the Governor. This wish was granted and at Government House six of the labourers, led by John Alexander Tom, told Moloney that they were distressed at the rate of wages being offered for the coming season. The Governor expressed his sympathy but then went on to lecture the deputation about the law of supply and demand, telling the men that the contractors were offering what the market could stand and that he had no power to increase wages.<sup>30</sup>

This was hardly what the deputation had come to hear and they went away to prepare a written statement. Two days later, on the 8th, they handed over their petition to Moloney setting out their grievances in detail. These included the fact that wages had been falling for some time; that prior to October, 1894, the sol had depreciated markedly; that government taxes and import dues had not been revalued; that prices and rents had risen appreciably; that prisoners had been used of late to unload logs when labourers were unemployed; and finally the document reminded him that they brought the Colony its prosperity and yet were unrepresented in the Legislative Council, with no one to protect their interests.

The petition was signed by ninety-two woodcutters, and the Governor considered that its contents were serious enough and the point of its last paragraph true enough, to call a meeting of the employers of labour to discuss it.<sup>32</sup> At that meeting, on the 10th, the leading employers, who were also the main traders and the backbone of the Legislative Council, the Public Meeting and the 'People's Committee,' poured scorn on its substance and its signatories. E. E. Connor, MLC, (the local manager of the BEC) asserted that his company was offering \$8 gold, that it was all it could afford, that not one of his employees had signed the petition, and anyway that there were not six bona-fide woodcutters among the undersigned. J. M. Currie, the sole remaining partner of Mutrie, Arthur and Currie, Chairman of the 'People's Committee' and chief money-lender in the capital, also said that none of his labourers had signed the petition and that the names on the list were chiefly those of "loafers, who belonged to a class of idle habits."<sup>33</sup>

He thought that the petition was not worthy of consideration and wanted to know who this 'Tom' was; presumably, he thought, some "public house politician."<sup>34</sup> Carlos Melhado, MEC, of Cramer's, made the point that the



mahogany market was depressed and that no employer was going to offer more than necessary, especially when labour could be obtained for \$5-7.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, he considered the labourers who signed the petition were not real mahogany cutters and even if they were they always had cash for drink. These sentiments summed up the general opinion and were echoed by the other employers present — J. M. Rosado, MLC, of Robertson's, A. Beattie of Beattie's, W. G. Aikman of Aikman's, and Alexander Williamson, MEC, who owned vast tracts of land and was also an important employer. Those gentlemen were united in their opposition to the petition and the petitioners, and the only suggestion they had for the Governor was that he revise the customs duties.<sup>36</sup>

(TO BE CONTINUED)

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The only mention of it in secondary sources is (i) by Frank Cundall in 'Political and Social Disturbances in the West Indies', (Institute of Jamaica, Educational Supply Co., Kingston, 1906) p. 21, and (ii) by Wayne Clegern in 'British Honduras, Colonial Dead End 1859-1900' (Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1967) p. 87.
2. 'Colonial Guardian', July 8, 1893.
3. Ibid., September 24, 1892, and Moloney to Ripon, January 31, 1893: CO 123/202:2885.
4. 'Colonial Guardian', July 8, 1893.
5. By Ordinances No. 31 and 32 of 1894. For an account of the change see Clegern, op. cit., p. 85. Clegern has the month of the change as November. This is incorrect.
6. 'Colonial Guardian', January 19, 1895.
7. According to the 'Colonial Guardian' (October 27, 1894) there was a short-lived and unsuccessful strike of Government carpenters, cartmen, scavengers, dredgemen and firemen who demanded one dollar gold for one sol, but who were forced to accept 60¢ gold for each sol earned. This is the only reference I have found to this event, but if it took place it was probably the first piece of 'industrial action' in the history of Belize.
8. Blue Books, 1890-94. The defence of the Colony cost more than any other single item of expenditure including that on public works, both capital and recurrent.
9. G. E. Bayly to Major Kaye, October 24, 1894. An en-

- closure with Moloney to Ripon, November 9, 1894.
10. The District Commissioner of Orange Walk, Dr. J. H. Harrison (later Chief Medical Officer and an Anglo-Indian) reported that Hall was a "giant of a man" who had been armed with a razor and had said "he would see us all in hell before he would be taken." J. H. Harrison to the Colonial Secretary, an enclosure with Moloney to Ripon, January 4, 1895. CO 123/210:1098.
  11. Report of Major Bayly, November 11, 1894; an enclosure with Moloney to Ripon. CO 123/208:20479.
  12. Report of the Inspector Commandant (A. B. R. Kaye) dated November 7, 1894. An enclosure with Moloney to Ripon, November 11, 1894. CO 123/208:20479.
  13. The offending paragraph was: "The rank and file of the Constabulary refused to receive the pay at 72 cents to the sol. If they would disband good mahogany captains — men of physique and courage superior to the men of the present Constabulary Force — could be got for \$23 a month of the present currency" ('Colonial Guardian', November 3, 1894). The attitude of this newspaper to the men of the Constabulary can be ascertained by its earlier statement that the force was "containing not a little of the human scum and off-scourings of Barbados" who came "to domineer and tyrannise over the natives" (August 11, 1894).
  14. Report of the Inspector Commandant, op. cit.
  15. Moloney to Ripon, November 9, 1894. CO 123/208:20479.
  16. Ibid.
  17. Telegram. Moloney to Ripon. Received November 13, 1894. CO 123/208:19859.
  18. Moloney to Ripon, November 16, 1894. CO 123/208:21050.
  19. Extensive correspondence as to the exact terms of the original recruitment was carried on after the mutiny. The Governor of Jamaica insisted that the equivalent of \$23 sols was the wage offered, but there was enough doubt on the subject to enable the Colonial Office to regard subsequent claims by the discharged men with some seriousness. The controversy was finally ended by the Statute of Limitations in 1924. The plaintiffs never possessed the wherewithal to employ the necessary legal advisors to press their claims. Of this the Colonial Office was well aware.
  20. 'Times of Central America', July 20 and November 9, 1894. The 'Times' was a radical newspaper which existed between 1894 and 1896.
  21. 'Colonial Guardian', November 10, 1894. Dr. Gahne's liberalism was reserved for persons he regarded as British Hondurans: it did not extend to foreigners. It is interesting to compare his sympathy with the



- aims of the labourers in the December riot with his almost blanket condemnation of the aims and methods of the West Indian constables in the November mutiny.
22. In D. N. A. Fairweather's "A Short History of the Volunteer Forces of British Honduras" (no publisher or place of publication, 1977) p. 20 there is only one line devoted to the history of the Constabulary, and no mention of the mutiny. Clegern, op. cit., attributes the mutiny purely to the numerical decrease in wages.
  23. 'Colonial Guardian', November 10, 1894.
  24. The hostile witness was E. Brodie Hoare, principal director of the BEC, quoted in the 'Times of Central America' (January 25, 1895). The 'Times' claimed that Brodie Hoare chose to ignore the real reason which was that his, and other companies, refused to offer a living wage. The historian was Cundall, op. cit., p. 21, who termed it a 'Currency Riot.' Clegern, op. cit., p. 87, the only other historian of the riot, saw its causes as "the low wages caused by the conversion to gold, as well as . . . a scarcity of jobs for the coming year."
  25. Petition of the Labourers to the Governor. An enclosure with Moloney to Ripon, December 20, 1894. CO 123/209:265.
  26. Petition, op. cit., substantiated by the 'Colonial Guardian', October 20, 1894.
  27. Ibid. Surprisingly this was true. Administrative error (it was not deliberate) failed to make any allowances for reductions in specific duties so that, after October 15, these were levied at twice their pre-change figures. Although ad valorem duties remained the same, most of the labourers' "necessities" were imported under a specific duty. The point was that the merchants made no such distinction. Substantiated by the 'Colonial Guardian', January 12, 1895, and the 'Times', April 5, 1895. The riot led to the Government passing an ordinance (No. 36 of 1894) revising the duties, but not before the newspapers and the Colonial Office had been scathing on this manifestation of incompetence.
  28. 'Colonial Guardian', October 20, 1894, and the 'Times', October 26, 1894.
  29. 'Colonial Guardian', January 12, 1895. Evidence of Frederick Maxwell.
  30. Moloney to Ripon, December 20, 1894, op. cit. J. A. Tom was a Bahamanian by birth. The fact that several of the discontented labourers were West Indians and not Belize Creoles led some employers and the 'Colonial Guardian' to blame the trouble on outside "agi-

tators".

31. Petition, op. cit..

32. Moloney noted that "labour discontent may show itself in disorder especially in British Honduras where there is no representative organisation." Moloney to Ripon, December 20, 1894, op. cit..

33. Notes on a meeting of employers of labour to consider the woodcutters' petition held in the Council Chamber on December 10, 1894. An enclosure with Moloney to Ripon, December 20, 1894, op. cit..

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid. The attitude of capital to labour in the Colony is summed up in this comment of Melhado's. Employers would pay only what a man could be persuaded to work for. Because some labourers had already contracted for \$7, the employers saw no reason to offer a better wage.

36. Ibid.

